

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 14-17, 36-39 and 63-66 are pending in the present application.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claims 36-39 and 63-66.

In the June 3, 2005 Office Action, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,224,683 to Ide et al.; claims 1-3, 7-9 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,580,484 to Schneider in view of Ide et al.; and claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ide et al.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the telephone interview conducted on July 27, 2005. During the telephone interview, the feature of the tab being completely removed from the plate, and how this patentably distinguished over the cited references was discussed. It was agreed that adding such a limitation to rejected independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 would patentably distinguish these claims over the cited references. The Examiner reserved the right to conduct a further search for additional references which may teach or suggest the newly added claim limitations.

In view of the amendments to claims 1, 4, 7 and 14 made herein, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 and 14-17 patentably distinguish over the art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-9 and 14-17 is respectfully solicited.

Further, Applicants had submitted an Information Disclosure Statement on April 29, 2002. To date, however, Applicants have not yet received an initialed copy of the April 29, 2002 PTO/SB/08 Form indicating that the references listed thereon have been

considered and made of record in the present application. Accordingly, Applicants hereby respectfully request that the Examiner consider the references cited in the April 29, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement and return an initialed copy of the PTO/SB/08 Form with the next communication in this application. For the Examiner's convenience, a copy of the April 29, 2002 PTO/SB/08 Form is enclosed.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1, 4, 7 and 14, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-9, 14-17, 36-39 and 63-66 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: August 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard LaCava

Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

Based on Form PTO-1449  
(3/90)

ATTY. DOCKET NO.

515265-2001

SERIAL NO.

09/925,443

## LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT

(Use several sheets if necessary)

APPLICANT

Mary L. Parker

FILING DATE

August 9, 2001

GROUP

3713

## U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	AA	5,884,421	03/23/1999	Key			
	AB	6,086,697	07/11/2000	Key			
	AC						
	AD						
	AE						
	AF						
	AG						
	AH						
	AI						
	AJ						
	AK						

## FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION	
							YES	NO
	AL							
	AM							
	AN							
	AO							
	AP							

## OTHER PRIOR ART (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

	AQ		Rexall Sundown – “The Road to Success”, pages 1-3 and “Awards & Recognition”, pages 1-2 <a href="http://www.rexallsundown.com">www.rexallsundown.com</a> ;
	AR		“Good Conversation Game” (Buona Fortuna); Saucy, Meaty, Spicy & Cheesy; Pasta Time; A Dinner Party Game; made in U.S.A.
	AS		Spinning Barbie Cups
	AT		
	AU		
	AV		

EXAMINER

DATE CONSIDERED

\* EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.